



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/103,110	06/23/1998	STEVEN R. ESKILDSEN	042390.P5444	2641

7590 08/07/2002

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR AND ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BLVD  
7TH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

DINH, TUAN T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2827

DATE MAILED: 08/07/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/103,110

Applicant(s)

ESKILDSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan T Dinh

Art Unit

2827

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 May 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Double Patenting*

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 15-24 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,250,934. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitations of the claims 1-3 in U.S. Patent 6,250,934 encompass the limitations of the claims 15-24. Application uses the same term "a first receptacle" or "a casing" both performs the same function of "receiving" or "encasing" an IC package. Yet, applicant uses the term "upper opening" as a "first opening" and "back opening" as a "second opening". The "first receptacle" or "casing" defines the first and second opening that used to cover and protect an IC package when insert into the "first receptacle or casing".

This is provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 15-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krehbiel (U. S. Patent 5,026,297) in view of Ringer et al. (U. S. Patent 5,408,386).

As to claims 15-19, Krehbiel discloses an apparatus for use in a data processing as shown in figures 1-9 comprising:

an IC package (12, column 5, line 8) having multiple leads (32, 22, column 5, lines 25-26) extending from IC package (12);

a first receptacle (14) receiving the IC package (see figures 1, 7), the first receptacle (14) comprising a first opening which is a front opening (64, column 6, line 32) such that the first opening (64) receiving the multiple leads (32) and provides an opening (66, column 6, line 34), a second opening which is a back or bottom opening (86, column 7, lines 4-5) such that the IC package (12) is inserted into the first receptacle (14) through the second opening (column 7, lines 5-6), and at least one stop (88;90, column 7, line 9) positioned at the second opening (86) such that the stop holds

Art Unit: 2827

the IC package (12) securely within the first receptacle when the IC package is fully inserted into the first receptacle (14) (see figures 1 and 7).

Krehbiel does not show a second receptacle receiving the first receptacle, the second receptacle comprising multiple electrical contacts to contact the multiple leads of the IC package through the first opening of the first receptacle.

Ringer teaches a second receptacle (12; 14, figure 1 and 2) receiving a first receptacle (13, see figures 1-2, and 4), the second receptacle comprising multiple electrical contacts (41, figure 4) to contact the multiple leads (31) of the IC package through the first opening of the first receptacle.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a second receptacle as taught by Ringer to modify the apparatus of Krehbiel in order to provide an electrical communication between an IC package fit into a receptacle of a computer.

Regarding claims 20-24, the method steps are necessitated by the apparatus structure as it is disclosed by Krehbiel in view of Ringer.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 5/17/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

#### **Applicant argues:**

(a) Krehbiel does not show "an IC package is inserted through the second opening"

(b) Ringer does not show "a second opening through with an IC package is inserted"

**Examiner disagrees.**

Regarding argument (a), Krehbiel clearly shows in figure 2 that a cover (12), which is an IC package having SIP (18) including substrate (20). Krehbiel also shows the IC package (or cover 12) being inserted into a first receptacle (housing 14) having a first opening (64), see figures 1 and 7, through a second opening (86), the second opening (86) having stops (88, 90) for secure the IC package (12) into the first receptacle (14).

Regarding argument (b), **examiner does not state**, Ringer teaches, " a second opening through with an IC package is inserted"

Based on Krehbiel in view of Ringer, Ringer shows a second receptacle (12, 14) that receives a first receptacle (13) as disclosed in figures 1-2, and 4. The teaching of Ringer would employ a structure of Krehbiel (Krehbiel lacks of a second receptacle) in order to teach an electrical connection between an IC package apparatus electrically communicates into a receptacle of a computer system.

***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within


TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan T Dinh whose telephone number is 703-306-5856. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Talbott can be reached on 703-305-9883. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-1341 for regular communications and 703-308-1341 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

TD  
July 29, 2002

  
DAVID L. TALBOTT  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800